Digraphs with degree two and excess two are diregular

James Tuite

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Open University, Walton Hall, Milton Keynes

arXiv:1703.08739v1 [math.CO] 25 Mar 2017

Abstract

A k-geodetic digraph with minimum out-degree d has excess ϵ if it has order $M(d,k)+\epsilon$, where $M(d,k)$ represents the Moore bound for degree d and diameter k. For given ϵ, it is simple to show that any such digraph must be out-regular with degree d for sufficiently large d and k. However, proving in-regularity is in general non-trivial. It has recently been shown that any digraph with excess $\epsilon = 1$ must be diregular. In this paper we prove that digraphs with minimum degree $d = 2$ and excess $\epsilon = 2$ are diregular for $k \geq 2$.

Keywords: Degree/diameter problem, Diregularity, Digraph, Excess, Moore bound
2000 MSC: 05C35, 90C35, 05C20, 05C07

1. Introduction

The directed degree/diameter problem asks: what is the maximum possible order $n_{d,k}$ of a digraph with given maximum out-degree d and diameter k? Numerous applications arise in the design of large interconnection networks. Fixing a vertex v, it is simple to show by induction that for $0 \leq i \leq k$ there are at most d^i vertices at distance i from v. We therefore obtain the so-called Moore bound

$$n_{d,k} \leq 1 + d + d^2 + ... + d^k = M(d,k).$$

A digraph that attains this upper bound is called a *Moore digraph*. It is easily seen that a digraph is Moore if and only if it is out-regular with degree d, has diameter k and is k-geodetic, i.e. for any two vertices u, v there is at most one $\leq k$-path from u to v. It was shown in 1980 in [2] that Moore digraphs exist only in the trivial cases $d = 1$ and $k = 1$ (the digraphs in question are directed cycles and complete digraphs respectively). It is therefore of interest to find digraphs that in some sense approximate Moore digraphs.

Relaxing the requirement of k-geodecity, many authors have considered the problem of finding digraphs with maximum out-degree $\leq d$, diameter $\leq k$ and order $M(d,k) - \delta$ for some small *defect* δ. For diameter $k = 2$, it has been shown in [5] that there exists a digraph with defect $\delta = 1$ (or an *almost Moore digraph*) for every value of d. However, it is known that there are no almost Moore digraphs for diameters 3 and 4 [3, 4] or for degrees 2 or 3 for $k \geq 3$ [6, 1]. It was further shown in [8] that no digraphs with degree $d = 2$ and defect $\delta = 2$ exist for $k \geq 3$. The reader is referred to the survey [9] for more information.

An important first step in nonexistence proofs for digraphs with fixed degree and small defect is to show that any such digraph must be diregular. In [7], it is shown that any almost Moore digraph

Email address: james.tuite@open.ac.uk (James Tuite)

must be diregular and in [10] it is proven that digraphs with out-degree $d = 2$ and defect $\delta = 2$ are diregular.

If we preserve the k-geodecity requirement in the conditions for a digraph to be Moore, but instead relax the condition that the digraph should have diameter k, then we obtain the following interesting problem: what is the smallest possible order of a k-geodetic digraph with minimum out-degree $\geq d$? We shall say that a k-geodetic digraph with minimum out-degree d and order $M(d,k)+\epsilon$ has *excess* ϵ and will refer to such a digraph as a $(d,k,+\epsilon)$-digraph. In a digraph with excess ϵ, we can associate with every vertex u a set of ϵ vertices $O(u)$ such that there is a $\leq k$-path from u to v if and only if $v \notin O(u)$; this set is called the *outlier set* of u. For excess $\epsilon = 1$, we can instead think of an outlier function o; in the diregular case o is a digraph automorphism.

Compared with the abundance of literature on digraphs with small defect, coverage of this problem is sparce, with [13] an outstanding exception. In this paper it was proven that there are no diregular digraphs with degree $d = 2$ and excess $\epsilon = 1$. Strong conditions were also obtained on non-diregular digraphs with excess $\epsilon = 1$ and in consequence it was shown that no such digraphs exist for $d = 2, k = 2$. The proof of the nonexistence of non-diregular digraphs with excess $\epsilon = 1$ was completed by Miret, Sillasen and Miller [12].

In the present work, we demonstrate that there are no non-diregular digraphs with degree $d = 2$ and excess $\epsilon = 2$ for $k \geq 2$ in a manner analogous to [10].

2. Basic lemmas for non-diregular digraphs with excess $\epsilon \geq 2$

Firstly, we establish our notation. In this paper G will stand for a non-diregular k-geodetic digraph with minimum degree d and excess $\epsilon \geq 2$, i.e. a $(d,k,+\epsilon)$-digraph. We denote the Moore bound for degree d and diameter k by $M(d,k)$ and for convenience we set $M(d,k) = 0$ for $k < 0$. For any vertex u we will denote the set of ϵ outliers of u by $O(u)$; we can extend O to a set function by setting $O(X) = \cup_{x \in X} O(x)$ for all $X \subseteq V(G)$. We will denote a general outlier set by Ω and will occasionally say that an outlier set is an Ω-set. We also write $O^-(u) = \{v \in V(G) : u \in O(v)\}$ for the set of vertices of which $u \in V(G)$ is an outlier. Following the notation of [13, 7, 10], let $S = \{v \in V(G) : d^-(v) < d\}$ and $S' = \{v \in V(G) : d^-(v) > d\}$.

For $l \geq 0$ and any vertex u, let $N^l(u)$ be the set of vertices v with an l-path from u to v; similarly, for $l < 0$, $N^l(u)$ is the set of vertices v that are the initial vertices of $|l|$-paths that terminate at u. When $l = 1$ or -1, we will instead write $N^+(u)$ and $N^-(u)$ respectively. Let $T_l(u) = \cup_{j=0}^{j=l} N^j(u)$ for $l \geq 0$ and $T_l(u) = \cup_{j=l}^{j=0} N^j(u)$ for $l < 0$; for $l = k-1$ or $-(k-1)$, we put $T(u) = T_{k-1}(u)$ and $T^-(u) = T_{-(k-1)}(u)$ for short.

As a preparation for the derivation of our main result, we will begin by deducing some fundamental structural results that apply for any positive excess. In the following, it will be helpful for our analysis to assume out-regularity. The following Lemma shows that this assumption is valid for sufficiently large d and k.

Lemma 1. *If $\epsilon < M(d,k-1)$, then G is out-regular with degree d.*

Proof. If G is not out-regular, it must contain a vertex v with out-degree at least $d+1$. By k-geodecity, it follows that

$$|V(G)| \geq |T_k(v)| \geq 1 + (d+1) + (d+1)d + ... + (d+1)d^{k-1} = M(d,k) + M(d,k-1).$$

As G has order $M(d,k) + \epsilon < M(d,k) + M(d,k-1)$, this is a contradiction. □

The conditions in Lemma 1 will be satisfied by all digraphs of interest in this paper. We now present the two main Lemmas on which the present work is based. The second is a generalisation of Lemma 2.2 of [13].

Lemma 2. $S \subseteq \cap_{u \in V(G)} O(N^+(u))$.

Proof. Let $v \in S$ and $u \in V(G)$. Write $N^+(u) = \{u_1, u_2, .., u_d\}$ and suppose that $v \notin O(u_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$. Let $v \notin N^+(u)$. Then for $1 \leq i \leq d$ there is a $\leq k$-path from u_i to v and so for $1 \leq i \leq d$ there is a $\leq (k-1)$-path from u_i to $N^-(v)$. As $d^-(v) \leq d-1$ it follows by the Pigeonhole Principle that there exists an in-neighbour v^* of v with two $\leq k$-paths from u to v^*, contradicting k-geodecity. Only trivial changes are necessary to deal with the case $v \in N^+(u)$. □

Lemma 3. $S' \subseteq \cap_{u \in V(G)} N^+(O(u))$.

Proof. Let $v' \in S'$ and $u \in V(G)$. Suppose for a contradiction that $v' \notin N^+(O(u))$. Then every in-neighbour of v' is reachable by a $\leq k$-path from u. If $u \notin N^-(v')$, then by the Pigeonhole Principle there must exist an out-neighbour u' of u with two $\leq (k-1)$-paths to $N^-(v')$, so that there are two $\leq k$-paths from u' to v', a contradiction. The result follows similarly if $u \in N^-(v')$. □

As every vertex has exactly ϵ outliers, this provides us with a limit on the size of the sets S, S'.

Corollary 1. $|S|, |S'| \leq \epsilon d$.

There are also natural restrictions on the in-degrees of vertices in S and S'.

Lemma 4. *For every vertex $v' \in S'$ we have $d+1 \leq d^-(v') \leq d+\epsilon$.*

Proof. Let $v' \in S'$ and consider the tree of depth k rooted at v'. Write $N^+(v') = \{v'_1, v'_2, ..., v'_d\}$. Every in-neighbour of v' lies in $(\cup_{i=1}^{d} T(v'_i)) \cup O(v')$. By k-geodecity, at most one in-neighbour of v' lies in any set $T(v'_i)$. As there are d such sets and ϵ vertices in $O(v')$, the result follows. □

Lemma 5. $\sum_{v \in S}(d - d^-(v)) = \sum_{v' \in S'}(d^-(v) - d)$.

Proof. By Lemma 1, the average in-degree must be d. □

Lemma 6. *If there is a $v' \in S'$ with $d^-(v') = d+\epsilon$, then every Ω-set is contained in $N^-(v')$.*

Proof. Let $u \in V(G)$ with $N^+(u) = \{u_1, u_2, .., u_d\}$. Suppose that $u \notin N^-(v')$. In each of the d sets $T(u_i)$ there lies at most one in-neighbour of v'. It follows that every outlier of u must be an in-neighbour of v'. The case $u \in N^-(v')$ is similar. □

3. Out-degree $d = 2$, excess $\epsilon = 2$

For the remainder of this paper, we will assume that G is a k-geodetic digraph with minimum out-degree $d = 2$ and excess $\epsilon = 2$, where $k \geq 2$. We will occasionally have to consider the case $k = 2$ separately. We now state our

Theorem 1 (Main Theorem)**.** *There are no non-diregular $(2, k, +2)$-digraphs for $k \geq 2$.*

We will proceed to derive a list of possible in-degree sequences for G. Analysing each in turn, we will derive a contradiction in each case, thereby proving the Main Theorem. Before embarking upon this program, we mention a final important Lemma that connects the case of excess two with previous work on excess one.

Lemma 7 (Amalgamation Lemma)**.** *Suppose that G contains vertices u_1, u_2 such that for all vertices $u \in V(G)$ we have $O(u) \cap \{u_1, u_2\} \neq \varnothing$. Then $N^+(u_1) \neq N^+(u_2)$.*

Proof. Suppose that $N^+(u_1) = N^+(u_2)$. Denote the graph resulting from the amalgamation of vertices u_1, u_2 by G^*. Inspection shows that if G^* is not k-geodetic, neither is G. G^* is therefore a $(2, k, +1)$-digraph, contradicting the results of [13] and [12].

□

4. There are no vertices in G with in-degree four

By Lemma 4, all vertices in S' have in-degree 3 or 4. In this section we shall prove that all vertices in S' must have in-degree 3. As $|S| \leq 4$, it follows by Lemma 5 that if G contains a vertex of in-degree 4, then the possible in-degree sequences of G are $(1, 1, 2, ..., 2, 4)$, $(1, 1, 1, 1, 2, ..., 2, 4, 4)$, $(1, 1, 1, 2, ..., 2, 3, 4)$ and $(1, 1, 1, 1, 2, ..., 2, 3, 3, 4)$. We can narrow down the possibilities further as follows.

Lemma 8. *If G contains a vertex v' with in-degree 4, then $|S| = 4$.*

Proof. Suppose that $|S| \leq 3$. Then

$$M(2,k) + 2 \geq |T_{-k}(v')| \geq 4 + 3M(2,k-2) + M(2,k-1) = 2 + M(2,k) + M(2,k-2),$$

which is impossible for $k \geq 2$. □

The only possible in-degree sequences for G are thus $(1, 1, 1, 1, 2, ..., 2, 4, 4)$ and $(1, 1, 1, 1, 2, ..., 2, 3, 3, 4)$. We need one final piece of structural information and then we can proceed to analyse the possible degree sequences.

Corollary 2. *If $|S| = 4$ and there is a vertex $v' \in S'$ with in-degree 4, then $S = N^-(v')$ and all Ω-sets are contained in S. If $\Omega \subset S$ is an outlier set, then so is $S - \Omega$.*

Proof. Putting $\epsilon = 2$ in Lemma 6, we see that $O(u) \subseteq N^-(v')$ for all $u \in V(G)$. Hence for any vertex u we have by Lemma 2

$$S \subseteq O(N^+(u)) \subseteq N^-(v').$$

As $|S| = |N^-(v')| = 4$, we must have equality in the above inclusion, i.e. $S = N^-(v')$.

Let $O(u) = \Omega$. Write $u^- \in N^-(u)$ and $N^+(u^-) = \{u, u^+\}$. By Lemma 2 we have

$$\Omega \cup O(u^+) = O(u) \cup O(u^+) = O(N^+(u^-)) = S,$$

so we must have $O(u^+) = S - \Omega$.

□

We are now in a position to show that neither of the remaining in-degree sequences can arise.

Theorem 2. *There are no $(2, k, +2)$-digraphs with in-degree sequence $(1, 1, 1, 1, 2, ..., 2, 4, 4)$ for $k \geq 2$.*

Proof. Let v_1', v_2' be the vertices with in-degree 4. By Corollary 2, $S = N^-(v_1') = N^-(v_2')$ and v_1' is not an outlier, so it follows that $v_2' \in T^-(v)$ for some $v \in S$. But as $N^-(v_2') = S$, it follows that there is a $\leq k$-cycle through v, contradicting k-geodecity. □



Figure 1: Subdigraph of any $(2, 2, +2)$-digraph with in-degree sequence $(1, 2, ..., 2, 3)$

Theorem 3. *There are no* $(2, k, +2)$*-digraphs with in-degree sequence* $(1, 1, 1, 1, 2, ..., 2, 3, 3, 4)$ *for* $k \geq 2$.

Proof. Let v' be the vertex with in-degree 4 and let w_1, w_2 be the vertices with in-degree 3. Write $S = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$. By Corollary 2, $N^-(v') = S$ and no vertex outside S is an outlier. Without loss of generality, suppose that $O(v') = \{v_1, v_2\}$. By Corollary 2, $\{v_3, v_4\}$ is also an Ω-set. By Lemma 3 we can thus assume that

$$v_1, v_3 \in N^-(w_1), v_2, v_4 \in N^-(w_2).$$

Again by Lemma 3, $\{v_1, v_3\}$ and $\{v_2, v_4\}$ cannnot be Ω-sets. The only other possible Ω-sets are $\{v_1, v_4\}$ and $\{v_2, v_3\}$. We see then that $\Omega \cap \{v_1, v_3\} \neq \varnothing$ for all Ω-sets and $N^+(v_1) = N^+(v_3)$, contradicting the Amalgamation Lemma.

□

It follows that no vertex of G has in-degree ≥ 4. By Lemma 5 and Corollary 1, we must therefore have $|S| = |S'|$ and $|S| \leq 4$, which leaves us with only four in-degree sequences to analyse, namely $(1, 2, ..., 2, 3), (1, 1, 2, ..., 2, 3, 3), (1, 1, 1, 2, ..., 2, 3, 3, 3)$ and $(1, 1, 1, 1, 2, ..., 2, 3, 3, 3, 3)$. For $|S| = r$, we will write $S = \{v_1, ..., v_r\}, S' = \{v'_1, ..., v'_r\}$.

5. Degree sequence $(1, 2, ..., 2, 3)$

Theorem 4. *There are no* $(2, k, +2)$*-digraphs with in-degree sequence* $(1, 2, ..., 2, 3)$ *for* $k \geq 3$.

Proof. We obtain a lower bound for $|T_{-k}(v'_1)|$ by assuming that $v_1 \in N^-(v'_1)$. By k-geodecity, all vertices in $T_{-k}(v'_1)$ are distinct, so

$$M(2, k) + 2 \geq |T_{-k}(v'_1)| \geq 2 + M(2, k - 2) + 2M(2, k - 1) = 1 + M(2, k) + M(2, k - 2).$$

This inequality is not satisfied for $k \geq 3$. □

This leaves open the question of whether there exists a non-diregular $(2, 2, +2)$-digraph with the given in-degree sequence. By the argument of the preceding Theorem, such a digraph must contain the subdigraph shown in Figure 1, which also displays the vertex-labelling that we shall employ. We proceed to show that no such digraph exists.

Evidently v' is not an outlier. Note that all arcs added to the subdigraph in Figure 1 must terminate in the set $\{z, x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2\}$. G is out-regular with degree $d = 2$, so we can assume without loss of generality that $z \to x_1$. By 2-geodecity, $x_1 \not\to z$ and $x_1 \not\to x_2$, so we can assume that $x_1 \to y_1$. Similarly, we must either have $y_1 \to z$ or $y_1 \to x_2$.

Lemma 9. $y_1 \not\to z$

Proof. Assume that $y_1 \to z$. $x \not\to x_1$ or x_2 by 2-geodecity. Also, $x \not\to z$, or we would have two paths $x_1 \to y_1 \to z$ and $x_1 \to x \to z$. Similarly, $x \not\to y_1$, or there would be paths $x_1 \to y_1$ and $x_1 \to x \to y_1$. Therefore $x \to y_2$. We now analyse the possible out-neighbours of y. $y \not\to y_1, y_2$. If $y \to x_1$, then there would be paths $y_1 \to z \to x_1$ and $y_1 \to y \to x_1$. Likewise $y \not\to z$, so $y \to x_2$. We now see that $v' \not\to x_2$ or y_2; for example, if $v' \to y_2$, then there would be paths $x \to y_2$ and $x \to v' \to y_2$. Since v' cannot be adjacent to two vertices linked by an arc, we see that v' cannot have two out-neighbours in $N^{-2}(v')$ without violating 2-geodecity.

□

Theorem 5. *There are no* $(2, 2, +2)$*-digraphs with in-degree sequence* $(1, 2, ..., 2, 3)$.

Proof. By Lemma 9, we have $y_1 \to x_2$. There are five possibilities for $N^+(v')$, namely $\{z, x_2\}$, $\{z, y_1\}$, $\{z, y_2\}$, $\{x_1, y_2\}$ and $\{x_2, y_2\}$; we discuss each case in turn.

Case i): $N^+(v') = \{z, x_2\}$

If $v \to y_1$, then we have paths $z \to x_1 \to y_1$ and $z \to v \to y_1$, so $v \not\to y_1$. Likewise, v is not adjacent to z, x_1 or x_2. Thus $v \to y_2$. Similarly, $x_2 \to y_2$. We must now have $x \to y_1$. However, this gives us paths $x_1 \to y_1$ and $x_1 \to x \to y_1$, which is impossible.

Case ii) $N^+(v') = \{z, y_1\}$

By 2-geodecity, $y \to x_1$; however, this yields paths $y \to v' \to y_1$ and $y \to x_1 \to y_1$.

Case iii): $N^+(v') = \{z, y_2\}$

As there are paths $x \to v' \to z$, $x \to v' \to y_2$ we cannot have $x \to z$ or $x \to y_2$. Obviously $x \not\to x_1, x_2$, so $x \to y_1$. Now there are paths $x_1 \to y_1$ and $x_1 \to x \to y_1$, a contradiction.

Case iv): $N^+(v') = \{x_1, y_2\}$

By 2-geodecity, we have successively $v \to x_2$, $x \to z$ and $y \to z$. But now we are led to conclude that $y_2 \to y_1$, violating 2-geodecity.

Case v): $N^+(v') = \{x_2, y_2\}$

By 2-geodecity, v cannot be adjacent to any of z, x_1, x_2, y_1 or y_2.

Having exhausted all possibilities, our proof is complete.

□

6. Degree sequence $(1, 1, 2, ..., 2, 3, 3)$

We shall assume firstly that $k \geq 3$ and deal with the special case of $k = 2$ separately.

Lemma 10. *If* $k \geq 3$*, then for each* $v' \in S'$ *we have* $S \subset N^-(v')$.

Proof. Let $v' \in S'$ and consider $T_{-k}(v')$. Suppose that neither v_1 nor v_2 lies in $N^-(v')$. Then for $k \geq 2$, by k-geodecity

$$M(2, k) + 2 \geq 4 + 2M(2, k-3) + 2M(2, k-1) = 2 + M(2, k) + M(2, k-2),$$

a contradiction. Now suppose that $|S \cap N^-(v')| = 1$. We would then have

$$M(2, k) + 2 \geq 3 + 2M(2, k-1) + M(2, k-3) = 2 + M(2, k) + M(2, k-3),$$

which again is impossible for $k \geq 3$.

□



Figure 2: Configuration for in-degree sequence $(1, 1, 2, ..., 2, 3, 3)$

Hence we can set $N^-(v_1') = \{v_1, v_2, x\}, N^-(v_2') = \{v_1, v_2, y\}$. This situation is displayed in Figure 2, where $N^-(v_i) = \{v_i^-\}$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Corollary 3. *$d(v_1', v_2') \geq k$ and $d(v_2', v_1') \geq k$. If $d(v_1', v_2') = k$, then $v_1' \in N^{-(k-1)}(y)$, and similarly if $d(v_2', v_1') = k$, then $v_2' \in N^{-(k-1)}(x)$.*

Corollary 4. $|O^-(v_1)| = |O^-(v_2)| = 2^k + 1$.

Proof. By k-geodecity, $v_2, v_1', v_2' \notin T^-(v_1)$, so $|T_{-k}(v_1)| = 1 + M(2, k-1)$, yielding $|O^-(v_1)| = M(2,k) + 2 - (1 + M(2, k-1)) = 2^k + 1$. Similarly for v_2. □

Corollary 5. *If $d(v_1', v_2') = k$, then $|O^-(y)| = 1$ and if $v_2' \in O(v_1')$, then $|O^-(y)| = 2$. Similarly, $|O^-(x)| = 1$ if $d(v_2', v_1') = k$ and $|O^-(x)| = 2$ if $v_1' \in O(v_2')$.*

Proof. Similar to the proof of Corollary 4. □

Lemma 11. $|O^-(v_1')| = |O^-(v_2')| = 1$.

Proof. Consider $|T_{-k}(v')|$, where $v' \in S'$. Counting distinct vertices of G,

$$M(2,k) + 2 = 3 + 2M(2, k-2) + M(2, k-1) + |O^-(v')| = 1 + M(2,k) + |O^-(v')|.$$

□

Lemma 12. $x \neq y$.

Proof. Suppose that $x = y$. As $N^-(v_1') = N^-(v_2')$, we must have $v_1' \in O(v_2'), v_2' \in O(v_1')$, so by Corollary 5 $|O^-(x)| = 2$. As $N^+(v_1) = N^+(v_2) = N^+(x)$, by k-geodecity we have $O(v_1) = \{v_2, x\}, O(v_2) = \{v_1, x\}, O(x) = \{v_1, v_2\}$, so $O^-(x) = \{v_1, v_2\}$. By Lemma 3, every Ω-set must intersect $\{v_1, v_2, x\}$, so it follows that every Ω-set contains an element of $\{v_1, v_2\}$, contradicting the Amalgamation Lemma. □

Lemma 13. *Let Ω be an outlier set. Then either $\Omega \cap S \neq \varnothing$ or $\Omega = \{x, y\}$. $\{x, y\}$ is an Ω-set.*

Proof. By Lemma 3 and the Amalgamation Lemma. □

Let α denote the number of vertices of G with outlier set $\{v_1, v_2\}$ and β the number of vertices with outlier set $\{x, y\}$.

Lemma 14. $\alpha = \beta + 1$.

Proof. By Corollary 4, v_1 and v_2 appear in $2(2^k + 1) - \alpha = 2^{k+1} + (2 - \alpha)$ Ω-sets. By Lemma 13, any Ω-set that does not contain either v_1 or v_2 must equal $\{x, y\}$. It follows that

$$M(2, k) + 2 = 2^{k+1} + 1 = 2^{k+1} + 2 - \alpha + \beta,$$

implying the result. □

Corollary 6. *$v_2 \in O(v_1)$, $v_1 \in O(v_2)$ and $d(v_1', v_2') = d(v_2', v_1') = k$.*

Proof. Suppose that $d(v_1, v_2) \leq k$. Then we must have

$$S' \cap T^-(v_2) = N^+(v_1) \cap T^-(v_2) \neq \varnothing,$$

contradicting k-geodecity. Thus $v_2 \in O(v_1)$ and similarly $v_1 \in O(v_2)$.

Suppose that $v_2' \in O(v_1')$. Then v_1 and v_2 have no out-neighbours in $T^-(y)$, so

$$O(v_1) = \{v_2, y\}, O(v_2) = \{v_1, y\}.$$

By Corollary 5, $|O^-(y)| = 2$, so $\{x, y\}$ is not an Ω-set, contradicting Lemma 13. Likewise, the assumption $v_1' \in O(v_2')$ leads to a contradiction. □

Theorem 6. *There are no $(2, k, +2)$-digraphs with in-degree sequence $(1, 1, 2, ..., 2, 3, 3)$ for $k \geq 3$.*

Proof. It follows from Corollaries 5 and 6 and Lemma 13 that there is a unique vertex z such that $O(z) = \{x, y\}$. Furthermore, no other Ω-set contains x or y. Hence, by Lemma 14, $\alpha = 2, \beta = 1$. Denote the two vertices with Ω-set $\{v_1, v_2\}$ by w, w'. Write $N^+(w) = \{w_1, w_2\}, N^+(w') = \{w_1', w_2'\}$.

It is easily seen that $\{w, w'\} \cap \{x, y\} = \varnothing$. Suppose that $w = x$ and set $w_2 = v_1'$. By Corollary 6, we must have $y \in N^{k-1}(v_1')$, so by k-geodecity $x, y, v_1, v_2 \notin T(w_1)$, so $O(w_1) = \{v_1', v_2'\}$, contradicting Lemma 13. The other cases are identical.

As $O(w) = \{v_1, v_2\}$, $x, y \in T(w_1) \cup T(w_2)$. Suppose that x, y lie in the same branch, e.g. $x, y \in T(w_1)$. By k-geodecity and the definition of w, $\{x, y, v_1, v_2\} \cap T(w_2) = \varnothing$, so that $O(w_2) = \{v_1', v_2'\}$, which is impossible by Lemma 13. Hence we can assume $x \in T(w_1), y \in T(w_2)$. Then $N^-(v_2') \cap T(w_1) = N^-(v_1') \cap T(w_2) = \varnothing$, so $v_2' \in O(w_1), v_1' \in O(w_2)$. Applying the same analysis to w', we see that we can assume $v_2' \in O(w_1'), v_1' \in O(w_2')$. By Lemma 11, it follows that $w_1 = w_1'$ and $w_2 = w_2'$, so that $N^+(w) = N^+(w')$. As $O(w) = \{v_1, v_2\}$, we must have $w' \in T_k(w)$. Hence there is a $\leq k$-cycle through either w_1 or w_2. □

Now we turn to the case $k = 2$. The argument of Lemma 10 shows that each member of S' has an in-neighbour in S. This allows us to deduce the following Lemma.

Lemma 15. *Neither element of S' is adjacent to the other.*

Proof. Suppose that $v_2' \to v_1'$. If $|N^-(v_1') \cap S| = 1$, then the order of G would be at least 10, whereas $|V(G)| = M(2, k) + 2 = 9$. Hence $|N^-(v_1') \cap S| = 2$ and since v_2' also has an in-neighbour in S, there would be an element of S with two ≤ 2-paths to v_1'. □

Theorem 7. *There are no* $(2,2,+2)$*-digraphs with in-degree sequence* $(1,1,2,...,2,3,3)$.

Proof. If $S \subset N^-(v_1') \cap N^-(v_2')$, then the argument for $k \geq 3$ remains valid, so we can assume that $N^-(v_1') \cap S = \{v_1, x, y\}$, where $\{x,y\} \cap (S \cup S') = \varnothing$. Simple counting shows that $O^-(v_1') = \varnothing$. We will write $N^-(x) = \{x_1, x_2\}, N^-(y) = \{y_1, y_2\}, N^-(v_1) = \{z\}$. Without loss of generality, there are four possibilities: i) $v_2 = z, v_2' = x_1$, ii) $v_2 = x_1, v_2' = z$, iii) $v_2 = y_1, v_2' = x_1$ and iv) $v_2 = x_1, v_2' = x_2$.

Case i) $v_2 = z, v_2' = x_1$:

v_2' has three in-neighbours. By Lemma 15, $v_1' \notin N^-(v_2')$. By 2-geodecity, $N^-(v_2') \cap T^-(x) = \varnothing$. v_1 and $z = v_2$ cannot both be in-neighbours of v_2', so v_2' must have exactly two in-neighbours in $T^-(y)$; necessarily $y_1, y_2 \in N^-(v_2')$ but $y \notin N^-(v_2')$. If $v_2 \to v_2'$, then there is no vertex other than x that v_2' can be adjacent to without violating 2-geodecity, so we must have $v_1 \to v_2'$ and $v_2' \to v_2$. As we already have a 2-path $v_2 \to v_1 \to v_2'$, v_2 cannot be adjacent to v_2', y_1 or y_2, so $v_2 \to x_2$. As all in-neighbours of v_2 and v_2' are accounted for, we must have $y \to x_2$. But now the only possible out-neighbourhood of v_1' is $\{y_1, y_2\}$, which gives two 2-paths from v_1' to v_2'.

Case ii) $v_2 = x_1, v_2' = z$:

As $v_1 \not\to v_2'$, Lemma 10 shows that $v_2 \to v_2'$. Without loss of generality, $N^-(v_2')$ must be one of $\{v_2, x_2, y_1\}, \{v_2, x_2, y\}$ or $\{v_2, y_1, y_2\}$. Suppose that $N^-(v_2') = \{v_2, x_2, y_1\}$. Then $v_2' \to y_2$ and $N^+(v_1')$ is either $\{v_2, y_2\}$ or $\{x_2, y_2\}$. If $N^+(v_1') = \{v_2, y_2\}$, then we can deduce that $x \to y_1$, $y \to x_2$ and $y_2 \to x_2$, so that there are paths $y_2 \to x_2$ and $y_2 \to y \to x_2$, so assume that $N^+(v_1') = \{x_2, y_2\}$. As y can already reach x_2 by a 2-path, there is an arc $y \to v_2$. v_2 has a unique in-neighbour, so $y_2 \to x_2$ and hence there are paths $v_1' \to x_2$ and $v_1' \to y_2 \to x_2$.

If $N^-(v_2') = \{v_2, x_2, y\}$, then y_1 cannot be adjacent to any of v_2', v_2, x_2 or y_2 without violating 2-geodecity. Hence we can assume that $N^-(v_2') = \{v_2, y_1, y_2\}$. Now we must have $v_2' \to x_2$. Without loss of generality, $x_2 \to y_1$ and $x \to y_2$. We cannot have $y \to x_2$, or there would be paths $y_1 \to y \to x_2$ and $y_1 \to v_2' \to x_2$, so $y \to v_2$. v_1' cannot be adjacent to both y_1 and y_2, so $v_1' \to x_2$ and hence also $v_1' \to y_2$. Now the only possible remaining arc is $v_1 \to y_1$, so that we have paths $v_2' \to v_1 \to y_1$ and $v_2' \to x_2 \to y_1$, which is impossible.

Case iii) $v_2 = y_1, v_2' = x_1$:

$N^-(v_2')$ must be either $\{z, v_2, y_2\}$ or $\{v_1, v_2, y_2\}$. In the first case, there are no vertices other than x that v_2' can be adjacent to without violating 2-geodecity, so $N^-(v_2') = \{v_1, v_2, y_2\}$. By 2-geodecity, $v_2' \to z$. If $y \to z$, then there would be distinct $\leq$ 2-paths from v_2 to z, so $y \to x_2$. v_1' is not adjacent to both v_2 and y_2 and is not adjacent to x_2, or there would be two $\leq$ 2-paths from y to x_2, so we see that $v_1' \to z$, implying that there are paths $v_1 \to v_2' \to z$ and $v_1 \to v_1' \to z$.

Case iv) $v_2 = x_1, v_2' = x_2$:

As $v_2 \not\to v_2'$, we have $v_1 \to v_2'$ and $N^-(v_2') = \{v_1, y_1, y_2\}$. Hence $v_2' \to z$. As y_1 can already reach z by a 2-path, $y \not\to z$, so $y \to v_2$. z must be adjacent to y_1 or y_2, but can already reach v_2' via v_1, yielding a contradiction.

Having dealt with every possibility, the result is proven. □

7. Degree sequence $(1,1,1,2,...,2,3,3,3)$

This represents the most difficult case to deal with. Again, we will discuss the cases $k = 2$ and $k \geq 3$ separately.

Lemma 16. *If* $k \geq 2$*, then for every* $u \in V(G)$ *we have* $|O(u) \cap S| = 1$ *or* 2*. There exists an* Ω*-set contained in* S*.*

Proof. Let $u \in V(G)$ be arbitrary. Let u^- be an in-neighbour of u and let u^+ be the other out-neighbour of u^-. By Lemma 2, if $S \cap O(u) = \varnothing$, then we would have $S \subseteq O(u^+)$. Since $|S| = 3$ and $|O(u^+)| = 2$, this is impossible. The other half of the Lemma follows trivially. □

Lemma 17. *If $k \geq 2$, then for each $v' \in S'$, $S \cap N^-(v') \neq \varnothing$.*

Proof. Assume that v' is an element of S' such that $S \cap N^-(v') = \varnothing$. Then we obtain a lower bound for $|T_{-k}(v')|$ by assuming that all members of S lie in $N^{-2}(v')$, whilst v' is at distance $\geq k$ from the remaining members of S'. This yields

$$|T_{-k}(v')| \geq 6 + 3M(2, k-3) + M(2, k-2) + M(2, k-1) = 3 + M(2, k) + M(2, k-3),$$

a contradiction. □

For $i = 1, 2, 3$, we will say that a vertex $v' \in S'$ is Type i if $|S \cap N^-(v')| = i$. As each member of S has out-degree two, it follows that if for $i = 1, 2, 3$ there are N_i vertices of Type i then $N_1 + 2N_2 + 3N_3 \leq 6$.

Lemma 18. *Let $k \geq 2$. Suppose that $v' \in S'$ is Type 1, with $N^-(v') \cap S = \{v\}$. Then for $v^* \in S - \{v\}$ we have $d(v^*, v') = 2$ and for $v'' \in S' - \{v'\}$ we have $d(v'', v') = k$. Also $O^-(v') = \varnothing$.*

Proof. The results for $k = 2$ follow by simple counting, so assume that $k \geq 3$. Let v', v be as described. Consider $T_{-k}(v')$. We obtain a lower bound for $|T_{-k}(v')|$ by assuming that $S - \{v\} \subset N^{-2}(v')$ and that $(S' - \{v'\}) \cap T^-(v') = \varnothing$. Hence

$$|V(G)| \geq |T_{-k}(v')| \geq 5 + 2M(2, k-3) + M(2, k-2) + M(2, k-1) = 2 + M(2, k) = |V(G)|.$$

Clearly, if v' were any closer to the remaining members of S' or if v' were any further from the vertices in $S - \{v\}$, $|T_{-k}(v')|$ would have order greater than $2 + M(2, k)$, which is impossible by k-geodecity. Evidently all vertices of G lie in $T_{-k}(v')$, so $O^-(v') = \varnothing$.

□

Our reasoning for the cases $k \geq 3$ and $k = 2$ must now part company, so we will now assume that $k \geq 3$ and return to the case $k = 2$ presently.

Lemma 19. *For $k \geq 3$, no two elements of S' are adjacent to one another.*

Proof. Suppose that there is an arc (v', v'') in G, where $v', v'' \in S'$. Consider $T_{-k}(v'')$. We obtain a lower bound for $|T_{-k}(v'')|$ by assuming that v'' is Type 2 and that v' is Type 1, whilst v'' lies at distance $\geq k$ from the remaining vertex in S'. Then by inspection

$$|T_{-k}(v'')| \geq 4 + M(2, k-1) + 2M(2, k-2) + M(2, k-3) = 2 + M(2, k) + M(2, k-3),$$

which is impossible for $k \geq 3$. □

Lemma 20. *There are no Type 3 vertices.*

Proof. Suppose for a contradiction that $v_1' \in S'$ is a Type 3 vertex, i.e. $N^-(v_1') = S$. As $N_1 + 2N_2 + 3N_3 \leq 6$, S' must contain a Type 1 vertex. We can assume that v_2' is Type 1 and $N^+(v_1) = \{v_1', v_2'\}, N^+(v_2) = \{v_1', v_3'\}$. It follows by Lemma 18 that $v_2 \in N^{-2}(v_2')$. Therefore we must have $N^+(v_2) \cap N^-(v_2') = \{v_1', v_3'\} \cap N^-(v_2') \neq \varnothing$, which contradicts Lemma 19. □

Lemma 21. *There is a Type 2 vertex.*

Proof. Assume for a contradiction that each vertex in S' is Type 1. Suppose that the sets $S \cap N^-(v'_i)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ are not all distinct; say (v_1, v'_1) and (v_1, v'_2) are arcs in G. Since v_1 has out-degree two, we can assume that (v_2, v'_3) is also an arc. By Lemma 18, we have $v_1 \in N^{-2}(v'_3)$. As the out-neighbours of v_1 are v'_1 and v'_2, it follows that either (v'_1, v'_3) or (v'_2, v'_3) is an arc, contradicting Lemma 19.

Hence we can assume that $N^+(v_i) = \{v'_i, v_i^+\}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ where $v_i^+ \notin S'$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. By Lemma 16, there is an outlier set Ω contained in S. By Lemma 3, S' must be contained in $N^+(\Omega)$; by inspection this is impossible. □

Lemma 22. *There is a Type 1 vertex.*

Proof. Suppose that $N_2 = 3$. We can set $N^-(v'_i) = S - \{v_i\}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Then for $i \neq j$ we must have $d(v'_i, v'_j) \geq k$, as $N^-(v'_i) \cap N^-(v'_j) \neq \varnothing$. As $N^+(v_3) = \{v'_1, v'_2\}$, it follows that $v'_3 \in O(v_3)$. By Lemma 3, $S' \subseteq N^+(O(v_3))$. By Lemma 19, $N^+(v'_3) \cap S' = \varnothing$, so, as G has out-degree $d = 2$, this is not possible. □

Lemma 23. *Let v' be a Type 2 vertex. Then $S \cap N^-(v')$ is not an Ω-set. Also, every vertex in G can reach exactly one member of $S \cap N^-(v')$ by a $\leq k$-path. If $v', v'' \in S'$ are both Type 2 vertices, then $S \cap N^-(v') \neq S \cap N^-(v'')$.*

Proof. For definiteness, suppose that v'_1 is a Type 2 vertex, with $S \cap N^-(v'_1) = \{v_1, v_2\}$. Suppose that $\{v_1, v_2\}$ is an Ω-set. By Lemma 3, $S' \subset N^+\{v_1, v_2\}$. We can thus suppose that there are arcs (v_1, v'_2) and (v_2, v'_3) in G. By Lemma 22 we can assume that v'_2 is Type 1. By Lemma 18, $v_2 \in N^{-2}(v'_2)$ so that $N^+(v_2) \cap N^-(v'_2) = \{v'_1, v'_3\} \cap N^-(v'_2) \neq \varnothing$, contradicting Lemma 19. Therefore $\{v_1, v_2\}$ is not an Ω-set.

Let u be a vertex that can reach both v_1 and v_2 by a $\leq k$-path. Let $u^- \in N^-(u)$ and $N^+(u^-) = \{u, u^+\}$. By Lemma 2 we must then have $O(u^+) = \{v_1, v_2\}$, a contradiction. Suppose now that v'_1 and v'_2 are Type 2 vertices and $S \cap N^-(v'_1) = S \cap N^-(v'_2) = \{v_1, v_2\}$. Then $N^+(v_1) = N^+(v_2)$, which by the preceding argument contradicts the Amalgamation Lemma. □

Corollary 7. *There are two Type 1 vertices and a unique Type 2 vertex.*

Proof. Suppose that v'_1 and v'_2 are Type 2 vertices, so that v'_3 is Type 1. By Lemma 23 we can assume that $S \cap N^-(v'_1) = \{v_1, v_2\}, S \cap N^-(v'_2) = \{v_1, v_3\}$ and $v_2 \in N^-(v'_3)$. By Lemma 18, we then have $v_1, v_3 \in N^{-2}(v'_3)$. It follows that v_1 has an out-neighbour in $N^-(v'_3)$, contradicting Lemma 19. □

We can therefore assume for the remainder of this subsection that v'_1 and v'_2 are Type 1 and v'_3 is Type 2. Write x for the in-neighbour of v'_3 that does not lie in S.

Lemma 24. $S \cap N^-(v'_1) = S \cap N^-(v'_2)$.

Proof. Suppose that $S \cap N^-(v'_1) \neq S \cap N^-(v'_2)$. By Lemma 18, without loss of generality we can put

$$v_1 \in N^-(v'_1), v_2, v_3 \in N^{-2}(v'_1), v_2 \in N^-(v'_2), v_1, v_3 \in N^{-2}(v'_2).$$

We cannot have $N^+(v_1) \subset S'$, or $v_1 \in N^{-2}(v'_2)$ would imply that two vertices of S' are adjacent. Thus $v_1 \notin N^-(v'_3)$. Similar reasoning applies to v_2. However, there are two members of S in $N^-(v'_3)$, a contradiction. □

We can now set without loss of generality $v_1 \in N^-(v_1') \cap N^-(v_2'), v_2, v_3 \in N^{-2}(v_1') \cap N^{-2}(v_2')$ and $S \cap N^-(v_3') = \{v_2, v_3\}$. It follows from Lemma 23 that for every vertex u we have $|O(u) \cap \{v_2, v_3\}| = 1$. We can assume that $v_3 \in O(v_1), v_2 \notin O(v_1)$. Write $N^+(v_2) = \{v_3', v_2^+\}$ and $N^+(v_3) = \{v_3', v_3^+\}$. By the Amalgamation Lemma $v_2^+ \neq v_3^+$.

Lemma 25. $O^-(v_3') = \varnothing$.

Proof. Suppose that for some outlier set we have $v_3' \in \Omega$. By Lemma 19, $N^+(v_3') \cap S' = \varnothing$, so that we cannot have $S' \subseteq N^+(\Omega)$, contradicting Lemma 3. □

As there is a $\leq k$-path from v_1 to v_2, either v_1' or v_2' lies in $T^-(v_2)$; assume that $v_1' \in T^-(v_2)$. Suppose that $d(v_1', v_2) \leq k-2$. There is a path of length 2 from v_2 to v_1', so there would be a $\leq k$-cycle through v_1', which is impossible. It follows that $d(v_1', v_2) = k-1$.

As v_1 must lie in $T_{-k}(v_3')$, we must have $v_2' \in T^-(v_3')$. If $d(v_2', v_3') \leq k-2$, then there would be two $\leq k$-paths from v_2 and v_3 to v_3'. Thus $d(v_2', v_3') = k-1$. If v_2' lies in $N^{-(k-2)}(v_2)$ or $N^{-(k-2)}(v_3)$, there would be a $\leq k$-cycle in G through v_2 or v_3 respectively. Hence $v_2' \in N^{-(k-2)}(x)$.

Corollary 8. $O^-(x) = \varnothing$.

Proof. As $v_2' \in N^{-(k-2)}(x)$ and $v_1', v_3', v_2, v_3 \notin T^-(x)$, $|T_{-k}(x)| = M(2,k) + 2$. □

Lemma 26. $v_1 \notin \{v_2^+, v_3^+\}$.

Proof. Suppose that $v_1 = v_2^+$. Denote the in-neighbour of v_1' that does not belong to $\{v_1, v_3^+\}$ by v_1^* and the in-neighbour of v_2' that does not belong to $\{v_1, v_3^+\}$ by v_2^*. By Lemma 18, v_1' and v_2' are not outliers and $d(v_2', v_1') = d(v_3', v_1') = k$. We cannot have $v_2' \in T^-(v_1)$, or there would be a k-cycle through v_1. Also $v_2' \notin T^-(v_3^+)$, or there would be a k-cycle through v_3^+. Likewise, $v_3' \notin T^-(v_1)$, or there would be a $(k-1)$-cycle through v_2, and $v_3' \notin T^-(v_3^+)$, or there would be two $\leq k$-paths from v_3 to v_3^+. It follows that $v_2', v_3' \in N^{-(k-1)}(v_1^*)$ and likewise we have $v_1', v_3' \in N^{-(k-1)}(v_2^*)$. As $S \cap T^-(v_1^*) = S \cap T^-(v_2^*) = \varnothing$, it follows that $|T_{-k}(v_1^*)| = |T_{-k}(v_2^*)| = M(2,k) + 2$, so that $O^-(v_1^*) = O^-(v_2^*) = \varnothing$. By Lemma 3, possible Ω-sets are

$$\{v_2, v_1\}, \{v_2, v_3^+\}, \{v_3, v_1\}, \{v_3, v_3^+\}.$$

But then every Ω-set contains either v_1 or v_3^+ and $N^+(v_1) = N^+(v_3^+)$, contradicting the Amalgamation Lemma. □

Theorem 8. *There are no $(2, k, +2)$-digraphs with in-degree sequence $(1, 1, 1, 2, ..., 2, 3, 3, 3)$ for $k \geq 3$.*

Proof. By Lemma 26, $N^-(v_1') = N^-(v_2') = \{v_1, v_2^+, v_3^+\}$. By Lemma 18, we have $v_2' \in N^{-k}(v_1')$. But it is easy to see that whether v_2' lies in $T^-(v_1), T^-(v_2^+)$ or $T^-(v_3^+)$, there will be a k-cycle through v_1, v_2^+ or v_3^+ respectively. □

It remains only to deal with the case $k = 2$. First we need to prove the equivalent of Lemma 19, i.e. that S' is an independent set.

Lemma 27. *For $k = 2$, no two members of S' are adjacent.*

Proof. Suppose that $v_2' \to v_1'$. By 2-geodecity, v_1' must be Type 2, v_2' is Type 1 and $O^-(v_1') = \varnothing$. By the same reasoning, if $v_3' \to v_2'$, then v_2' would be Type 2, a contradiction. Hence we can assume that $N^-(v_1') = \{v_1, v_2, v_2'\}, N^-(v_2') = \{v_3, x, y\}, N^-(v_1) = \{z\}$ and $N^-(v_2) = \{v_3'\}$, where $d^-(x) = d^-(y) = d^-(z) = 2$.

Obviously $v_2 \not\to v_3'$, so v_3' is either Type 1 or Type 2. Suppose that $v_3 \to v_3'$. Then v_2' cannot be adjacent to v_3', or there would be two ≤ 2-paths from v_3 to v_3'. Hence $v_2' \to z$. This implies that x and y are not adjacent to z, as they can already reach z via v_2'. Therefore x and y are adjacent to v_3'. Now v_3' cannot be adjacent to any of v_3, x or y, so $v_3' \to z$, thereby creating paths $v_3 \to v_3' \to z$ and $v_3 \to v_2' \to z$. Therefore $v_3 \not\to v_3'$.

By Lemma 17 we must have $v_1 \to v_3'$. As $v_3 \not\to v_3'$, it follows that $v_3 \to z$. Now v_2' cannot be adjacent to z, or there would be distinct ≤ 2-paths from v_3 to z, so $v_2' \to v_3'$. However, this implies that v_3' is Type 2, which is impossible. □

Lemma 28. *Every vertex in S' is Type 2.*

Proof. Suppose that S' contains a Type 1 vertex; say v_1' is Type 1, with $N^-(v_1') = \{v_1, x, y\}$, where $d^-(x) = d^-(y) = 2$. Write $N^-(v_1) = \{z\}, N^-(x) = \{x_1, x_2\}, N^-(y) = \{y_1, y_2\}$. Without loss of generality there are six possible configurations: i) $v_2' = y_1, v_3' = y_2, v_2 = z, v_3 = x_1$, ii) $v_2' = x_2, v_3' = y_1, v_2 = z, v_3 = x_1$, iii) $v_2' = z, v_3' = x_1, v_2 = x_2, v_3 = y_1$, iv) $v_2' = z, v_3' = x_1, v_2 = y_1, v_3 = y_2$, v) $v_2' = y_1, v_3' = y_2, v_2 = x_1, v_3 = x_2$ and vi) $v_2' = x_2, v_3' = y_2, v_2 = x_1, v_3 = y_1$.

Firstly, note that we cannot have $v_2' = y_1, v_3' = y_2$, since then x_1 and x_2 would have to be adjacent to both v_2' and v_3', which is impossible, since G has out-degree two. Also, we cannot have $v_2' \in N^-(x), v_3' \in N^-(y)$, for then v_2' and v_3' would be adjacent, violating Lemma 27. This leaves us only cases iii) and iv) to analyse.

In case iii), we must have $N^-(v_3') = \{v_1, v_3, y_2\}$. As $v_3' \not\to v_2'$, v_2' has at most one in-neighbour in $T^-(x)$, so that v_3 and y_2 also lie in $N^-(v_2')$, which is impossible. Finally, in case iv), we must have $N^-(v_3') = S$, so that v_2' cannot have any in-neighbours in S, contradicting Lemma 17. Therefore S' contains no Type 1 vertices. From $N_1 + 2N_2 + 3N_3 \leq 6$, it now follows that every vertex of S' is Type 2 and $N^+(v_i) \subset S'$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. □

Distinct vertices from S cannot have identical out-neighbourhoods; for example, if $N^+(v_1) = N^+(v_2) = \{v_1', v_2'\}$, then v_3' could not be Type 2. For $i = 1, 2, 3$, we can therefore set $N^-(v_i') = (S - \{v_i\}) \cup \{x_i\}$, where $d^-(x_i) = 2$. As $S' \cap N^-(S') = \varnothing$, we see that $O^-(v_i') = \{v_i\}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. We now have enough information to complete the proof.

Theorem 9. *There are no $(2, 2, +2)$-digraphs with in-degree sequence $(1, 1, 1, 2, ..., 2, 3, 3, 3)$.*

Proof. Write $N^-(v_i) = \{z_i\}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and put $N^-(x_1) = \{y_1, y_2\}$. There are three distinct cases to consider, depending on the position of v_2' and v_3' in $T_{-2}(v_1')$: i) $v_2' = z_2, v_3' = z_3$, ii) $v_2' = z_2, v_3' = y_1$ and iii) $v_2' = y_1, v_3' = y_2$.

Consider case i). v_3' is not adjacent to v_1 or v_2', so we can set $v_3' \to y_1$. v_2' cannot also be adjacent to y_1, or there would be distinct 2-paths from v_1 to y_1, so $v_2' \to y_2$. If $v_1' \not\to v_1$, then we would have $N^+(v_1') = N^-(x_1)$, violating 2-geodecity, so $v_1' \to v_1$. Now without loss of generality, $x_1 \to v_3'$ and at most one of y_1 and y_2 can be adjacent to v_2', so that there must be an arc joining y_1 and y_2, which is impossible.

In case ii), the only vertex other than v_1 and v_2 that can be an in-neighbour of v_3' is z_3, but in this case v_3' cannot be adjacent to any of y_2, z_3, v_1 or v_2', so we have a contradiction. Finally, in case iii) there are two 2-paths from v_1 to x_1. □

8. Degree sequence $(1, 1, 1, 1, 2, ..., 2, 3, 3, 3, 3)$

Lemma 29. *For every vertex u, $O(N^+(u)) = S$, $N^+(O(u)) = S'$ and $O(u) \subset S$. If Ω is an outlier set, so is $S - \Omega$.*

Proof. By Lemmas 2 and 3 we have $S \subseteq O(N^+(u))$ and $S' \subseteq N^+(O(u))$. As $|S| = |S'| = 4$, we must have equality in the inclusions. If $O(u) = \Omega$, let u^-, u^+ be such that $N^+(u^-) = \{u, u^+\}$; then we must have $O(u) \cup O(u^+) = S$, so that $O(u) \subset S$ and $O(u^+) = S - \Omega$. □

Corollary 9. *For all $v' \in S'$, $|N^-(v') \cap S| = 2$.*

Proof. Let $N^+(v') = \{w_1, w_2\}$. Let $O(w_1) = \Omega_1, O(w_2) = \Omega_2$, where $\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 = S$. Write $N^+(w_1) = \{w_3, w_4\}$ and $N^+(w_2) = \{w_5, w_6\}$. By k-geodecity, at most one in-neighbour of v' lies in $T(w_3)$ and at most one lies in $T(w_4)$ and furthermore $w_1 \notin N^-(v')$. It follows that an in-neighbour of v' lies in Ω_1. Applying the argument to w_2, another in-neighbour of v' lies in Ω_2. Hence $|N^-(v') \cap S| \geq 2$ for all $v' \in S'$.

Suppose that $|N^-(v'_1) \cap S| = 3$. As $|N^-(v'_i) \cap S| \geq 2$ for $i = 2, 3, 4$, we must have $\sum_{i=1}^{4} d^+(v_i) \geq 9$, which is impossible. □

Lemma 30. *No two elements of S have the same neighbourhood.*

Proof. Suppose that $V \subset S$, $|V| = 2$ and $|N^+(V)| = 2$. By Lemma 29, V is not an Ω-set, as $N^+(V) \neq S'$. Suppose that there exists a vertex u that can reach both vertices of V by $\leq k$-paths. Then by Lemma 29 $O(u) = S - V$, so that $S - (S - V) = V$ must be an Ω-set, a contradiction. Now we have a pair of vertices with identical out-neighbourhoods and with non-empty intersection with every Ω-set, violating the Amalgamation Lemma. □

Lemma 31. *There are only two distinct Ω-sets.*

Proof. Let $u \in V(G)$ and $N^+(u) = \{u_1, u_2\}$ and write $O(u_1) = \Omega_1, O(u_2) = \Omega_2$, where $\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 = S$. By Lemma 30, for $1 \leq i, j \leq 4$ and $i \neq j$

$$N^-(v'_i) \cap S \neq N^-(v'_j) \cap S.$$

None of the sets $N^-(v'_i) \cap S$ can be Ω-sets, since any such set has at most 3 out-neighbours. There are $\binom{4}{2}$ two-element subsets of S, all of which are accounted for by the two outlier sets Ω_1 and Ω_2 and the four sets $N^-(v'_i) \cap S$.

□

Theorem 10. *There are no $(2, k, +2)$-digraphs with in-degree sequence $(1, 1, 1, 1, 2, ..., 2, 3, 3, 3, 3)$ for $k \geq 2$.*

Proof. Let the distinct outlier sets of G be Ω_1 and Ω_2. As G has odd order $2^{k+1}+1$, one of these sets must occur more frequently as an Ω-set than the other. Take an arbitrary vertex u with $O(u) = \Omega_1$ and consider $T_k(u) \cup \Omega_1$, which contains all vertices of G without repetitions. By Lemmas 29 and 31, for every vertex w of G with out-neighbours w_1, w_2, we have $O(w_1) = \Omega_1, O(w_2) = \Omega_2$ or vice versa, so half of the vertices in $T_k(u) - \{u\}$ have outlier-set Ω_1 and half have outlier-set Ω_2. As $O(u) = \Omega_1$ and each element of Ω_1 has outlier-set Ω_2, it follows that the set Ω_2 occurs $2^k + 1$ times as an Ω-set and Ω_1 occurs 2^k times. However, repeating the argument with a vertex u with $O(u) = \Omega_2$ leads to the opposite conclusion, a contradiction. □

This concludes the proof of the Main Theorem.

9. Extremal non-diregular $(2, 2, +\epsilon)$-digraphs

We have seen that there are no non-diregular $(2, 2, +\epsilon)$-digraphs for $\epsilon \leq 2$ [12]; however, in [16] it is proven that there exist two distinct diregular $(2, 2, +2)$-digraphs. It is therefore of interest to determine the smallest possible excess of a non-diregular $(2, 2, +\epsilon)$-digraph. In [11] and [15] it is shown that from a diregular digraph of order n, maximum out-degree d and diameter k that contains a pair of vertices with identical out-neighbourhoods there can be derived a non-diregular digraph of order $n - 1$, maximum out-degree d and diameter $\leq k$ by means of a 'vertex deletion scheme'. By these means large non-diregular digraphs are constructed from Kautz digraphs in [15]. We will describe a 'dual' construction that enables us to derive a non-diregular $(d, k, +(\epsilon+1))$-digraph from a diregular $(d, k, +\epsilon)$-digraph.

Theorem 11 (Vertex insertion scheme)**.** *Let G be a diregular $(d, k, +\epsilon)$-digraph containing a pair of vertices with identical out-neighbourhoods. Then there exists a non-diregular $(d, k, +(\epsilon+1))$-digraph.*

Proof. Let G be a diregular $(d, k, +\epsilon)$-digraph containing vertices u and v such that $N^+(u) = N^+(v)$. Let $N^-(u) = \{u_1^-, u_2^-\}$. Form a new digraph G' as follows: add a new vertex z to G, set $N^+(z) = N^+(v)$, delete the arc (u_2^-, u) and insert an arc (u_2^-, z). By inspection, G' has maximum out-degree d, order $M(d, k) + \epsilon + 1$ and remains k-geodetic. □

As a diregular $(2, 2, +2)$-digraph with a pair of vertices with identical neighbourhoods is exhibited in [16], Theorem 11 allows us to deduce the smallest possible excess of a non-diregular $(2, 2, +\epsilon)$-digraph.

Corollary 10. *There is a non-diregular $(2, 2, +3)$-digraph.*

As such a digraph exists for $k = 2$, it would be of great interest to determine whether or not there exist digraphs with degree $d = 2$ and excess $\epsilon = 3$ for $k \geq 3$ in both the diregular and non-diregular cases.

10. References

References

[1] Baskoro, Miller, Širáň, Sutton, Complete characterization of almost Moore digraphs of degree three, J. Graph Theory 48 (2005), 112-126

[2] Bridges, Toueg, On the impossibility of directed Moore graphs, J. Combinatorial Theory B29 (1980), 339-341

[3] Conde, Gimbert, Gonzàlez, Miret, Moreno, Nonexistence of almost Moore digraphs of diameter three, Electron. J. Combin. 15 (2008)

[4] Conde, Gimbert, Gonzàlez, Miret, Moreno, Nonexistence of almost Moore digraphs of diameter four, Electron. J. Combin. 20(1) (2013)

[5] Fiol, Yebra, Alegre, Line digraph iterations and the (d, k)-digraph problem for directed graphs, Proc. 10th Int. Symp. Comput. Architecture (1983), 174-177

[6] Miller, Fris, Maximum order digraphs for diameter 2 or degree 2, Pullman Volume of Graphs and Matrices, Lecture Notes in Pure and Applied Math. 139 (1992), 269-298

[7] Miller, Gimbert, Širáň, Slamin, Almost Moore digraphs are diregular, Discrete Math. 218, No. 1-3 (2000), 265-270

[8] Miller, Širáň, Digraphs of degree two which miss the Moore bound by two, Discrete Math. 226, No. 1-3 (2001), 269-280

[9] Miller, Širáň, Moore graphs and beyond: A survey of the degree/diameter problem, Electron. J. Combin., Dynamic Survey DS14 (2005)

[10] Miller, Slamin, Diregularity of digraphs close to Moore bound, Prosiding Konperensi Nasional Matematika X, MIHMI Vol.6 No.5 (2000), 185-192

[11] Miller, Slamin, On the monotonicity of minimum diameter with respect to order and maximum out-degree, Computing and Combinatorics, Proceedings of 6th Annual International Conference, COCOON, (2000), 193-201

[12] Miret, Sillasen, Miller, Looking for digraphs of excess one, presented at the 7th International Workshop on Optimal Network Topologies, Tsinghua Sanya International Mathematics Forum, Sanya, China (2016)

[13] Sillasen, On k-geodetic digraphs with excess one, Electron. J. Graph Theory and Applications 2 (2) (2014), 150-159

[14] Sillasen, Digraphs of small defect or excess, Dep. of Math. Sciences, Aalborg Uni. (Ph.D. Report Series No.26) (2014)

[15] Slamin, Miller, On the existence of non-diregular digraphs of order two less than the Moore bound, Jurnal ILMU DASAR 12.1 (2011), 1-5

[16] Tuite, On diregular digraphs with degree two and excess two, preprint (2016)